R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 066 JC 670 448

STUDENT RATING OF FACULTY AT ST. JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE, WITH ADDENDUM FOR ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE.

BY- OVERTURF, C.L. PRICE, EDWIN C.
SAINT JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLL., PALATKA, FLA.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.36 34P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, *EVALUATION METHODS, *TEACHER EVALUATION, *STUDENT OPINION, STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP, STUDENT ATTITUDES, TEACHING QUALITY, PALATKA, FLORIDA,

STUDENTS EVALUATED THEIR INSTRUCTORS' PERSONAL TRAITS, SCHOLARSHIP, SKILL OF PRESENTATION, AND ACCURACY IN EVALUATION. THE QUESTIONNAIRE FORM EMPLOYED USED A NUMERICAL SYSTEM WHICH ALLOWED RANKING OF PROFESSORS ACCORDING TO TOTAL ADJUSTED SCORES. STUDENTS COULD WRITE COMMENTS ON TEACHER PERFORMANCE. INSTRUCTORS AWARDING HIGHER GRADES DID NOT RATE HIGHER THAN INSTRUCTORS AWARDING LOWER GRADES. HONORS STUDENTS RESPONDED MORE STRONGLY (FAVORABLY OR UNFAVORABLY) TO TEACHER PERFORMANCE. STUDENTS DID NOT RATE INSTRUCTORS TEACHING AT "PREFERRED" HOURS MORE HIGHLY THAN OTHER INSTRUCTORS. INSTRUCTORS RATED MOST HIGHLY WERE THOSE WHO TAUGHT TOWARD CLEARLY DEFINED AND COMMUNICATED OBJECTIVES, WHO USED ONLY RELEVANT MATERIALS, AND WHO WERE ALWAYS IN CHARGE OF THEIR CLASSES. (SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS AND A DISCUSSION OF THE LIMITATIONS OF THE SURVEY TECHNIQUE ARE INCLUDED.) (AD)

ED013066

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STUDENT RATING OF FACULTY

AT

ST. JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE

(With Addendum For

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE)

A Study Proposed Under Kellogg

Grant to Junior College Division of

Universities of Florida

Administrative Team Report

C.L. Overturf, Jr.

Edwin C. Price

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 8 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ST. JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE

Palatka, Florida

Spring, 1966

XEROX COPY XEROX COPY XEROX COPY XEROX COPY

JC 670 448

STUDENT RATING OF FACULTY AT ST. JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE

I. Purpose for Rating
   a. Improvement of instruction
   b. Retention and release (annual)
   c. Continuing contract
   d. Merit pay increases

II. History
   a. Begun by President Tilley 4 years ago to aid in completing rating forms required by State Board regulations
   b. Sampling first used
   c. Total population rating requested by faculty
   d. Recent faculty approval

III. Description of Method
   a. Instrument used (content and scale)
   b. Every student, every class, every instructor
   c. Follow through information
      (Faculty rank order, division rank order, correlation with grades given, correlation with honor-student rating, relationship to training and experience.)

IV. Findings and Results
   a. Faculty improvement
   b. Divisional results
   c. Correlation with high grades given insignificant
   d. Honor student rating correlation strong with greater spread
   e. Faculty testimonials

V. Recommendations
   a. Continue student rating
   b. Continue refinement of instrument and process
   c. Continue critical analysis of the entire "idea"
   d. Give thought to simplifying rating procedure.

XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY

INSTRUCTOR RATING AT ST. JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE

Philosophy

The administration and faculty at St. Johns River Junior College are committed to providing the best educational opportunities possible to the students of freshman and sophomore levels and to adults seeking the satisfactions that cultural and practical training may bring. As an aid to this committment, the administration works through the students to help each member of the faculty answer the question: "How am I doing?"

Purpose

Student ratings of faculty at St. Johns is one phase of a four-phase* evaluation that is completed each year. Florida law provides for an annual evaluation to be filed with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for each Junior College instructor. By making a thorough rating of the faculty other concomitant values are achieved. (1) Tentative criteria for faculty selection and improvement are pointed up. (2) Data for further faculty studies and evaluation are collected. (3) Basis is established for all contractual considerations: retention or release, continuing contracts, and merit pay.

History

The College began student ratings four years ago, and each year has attempted to improve the methods and procedures in line with faculty and student criticisms. A sampling of the total student population was first taken, but upon faculty request an every-student rating was instituted.

---

*The other three phases involve the division heads, the Instructional Dean, and the College President.

For the record, it should be stated that former President B.R. Tilley assumed a major role in initiating the student rating of the faculty, and he carefully directed it through the critical period while faculty was being introduced to the idea and learning to accept it. He discussed with his faculty frequently and frankly the purposes, procedures, and results of the ratings. Outstanding cooperation was achieved from the beginning.

The chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee recently distributed a ballot to all the instructors to determine the degree of their acceptance of the rating. The ballot allowed each faculty member to vote for or against the participation of the student body in faculty rating for all purposes including merit pay. Eighty-one percent of the faculty favored the students' participation.

Method and Procedure

The Academic Affairs Committee helped to set up the procedure for rating the faculty. It determined that the process should be sufficiently thorough to permit every student to rate each of his instructors. He was to rate only his present instructors. The committee agreed upon a rating instrument that allowed the student to evaluate the instructor on four counts: (1) Positive Personal Traits, (2) Scholarship, (3) Skill of Presentation, and (4) Accuracy in Evaluating Students. Each quality was assigned a maximum score of 5 points (Addendum #1). Hence the student could award a rating of from "1" to "5" on each quality. The faculty member's percentage of a perfect score was to be determined by

averaging the scores given on the four items then multiplying the average by 20. A code number would be assigned to each faculty member and arranged in descending rank order according to the rating (Addendum #2).

Each student was to be given an opportunity to write any comments he cared to concerning the effectiveness of the teacher he was rating. These comments were to be typed and a copy given to each instructor, but in no case would the instructor see the comments in the students' handwriting.

In order to keep the process as uniform as possible the Dean of the College personally visited each classroom, passed copies of the form to each student, and explained it. Then he and the instructor waited outside the door for the students to complete the rating and to return the ratings in a sealed envelope to the Dean. Approximately 500 classes and laboratories were visited during the last half of the fall trimester both on campus and at four evening centers. Nearly 10,000 responses were collected and punched on cards so that the data processing machines could aid in tabulating the information.

Once the process was completed, the College had the raw data with which to determine the overall student perceptions of their faculty in regard to a number of questions:

(1) In what category did the faculty rate highest and lowest

(2) What negative criticisms seemed to cause the lowest ratings

(3) What positive criticisms seemed to cause the highest ratings

(4) What divisions tended to rank highest and lowest

(5) Was there significant correlation between high ratings and high grades or low ratings and low grades

XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY

(6) Do honor-students tend to rate the same faculty members lower or higher than the total population rates them

(7) What educational and experiential background of the faculty member seems to make a difference

(8) Do faculty tend to remain constant in their ratings

Improvement of Instruction

Improvement of instruction is the overarching justification of all faculty ratings. What is happening, if anything, to the level of instruction should be indicated by the successive ratings of the same instructors. Therefore a comparison was made between the scores achieved by the full-time teaching faculty during the successive years 1964-65 and 1965-66.

It is significant to note here that fourteen of the fifty full-time instructors rated the first year did not return in the fall of 1965. Ten of these were in the lower half of the rating reducing the spread of returning faculty by nearly one-third (21.2). Fifteen who were in the lower half did return. All but one of the fifteen improved on the next rating. The average rise on the scale was 7.55. Five of the fifteen improved more than 10 points.

Interviews were held with faculty members who made significant improvement. Without exception each indicated that he took seriously the findings of the ratings. Particularly did the faculty members read carefully the reproduced student comments which were furnished each instructor immediately following the rating.

Further inspection of the 1964-65 rating scale revealed that the span of difference was twice as great with the faculty members in the lower half of the rank order (85.75 to 65.63) as the span in the top half of the rank order (96.02 to 86.00). No spectacular improvement of ratings for returning faculty members in the upper order would be anticipated because of the decreasing opportunity for ascendency on the scale. But there would have been general improvement in ratings of the upper half of the faculty had there not been three easily diagnosed spectacular drops in points: 11.0, 8.1, and 7.2. One was definitely a morale factor, and the other two were occasioned by change of assignments to novel and "challenging" situations. I refer specifically to the placement of a Negro instructor for the first time with predominately white students and a white instructor with predominately remedial students taught on the formerly all-Negro college campus.

Ratings by Divisions

Ratings of academic divisions were compared to determine the students' thinking concerning the most effective work being done (Addendum #3). The administration did not anticipate the resultant competition that arose from pride within the divisions.

Again, for this study, a comparison was made of divisional ratings for the last two years. It was discovered that all but two of the seven divisions changed positions in the rank order. The division of Health and Physical Education and the division of Communications held their respective places of 1st and 3rd. The Math-Science and Technical divisions made gains over the divisions of Social Science, Humanities, and Business.

The spread of the points between the highest and lowest ratings for the divisions for both years was only about one-third the spread between the ratings of the highest and lowest faculty member.

It is most significant to note that only two of the seven divisions failed to improve their point-ratings the second year, and that those two divisions were led by new division heads who did not have the experience of comparison the previous year. Also the writers noted that the lowest division in 1964-1965 made the greatest point gain in 1965-66.

High Grades, High Rating?

The faculty was interested to find if instructors who tend to award higher grades also receive higher ratings by their students. In order to determine the relationship between an instructor's total rating and his distribution of grades (A's, B's, C's, D's and F's) a method was devised to assign each instructor a grade distribution rating so that a rank order correlation could be calculated using the total student ratings rank order and the grade distributions rank order.

The following method was used to assign each instructor a rating based on his distribution of grades:

Each letter grade was assigned an arbitrary value: A: 400;

B: 100; C: 0; D: 200; F: 800.

Then the percentage of each of these grades assigned by an instructor was multiplied by the corresponding point value for each grade and these values were summed to give a total rating grade distribution rating for that instructor.

XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY

Using this method the highest and lowest ratings were given to instructors with the following distributions of grades:

Rank Rating	A	B	C	D	F
	400	100	0	-200	-800
1 186.9 Highest	46.9%	26.5%	12.2%	4.1%	2.0%
91 -364.0 Lowest	0%	7.2%	10.4%	16.0%	42.4%

Ranking all but the instructors in the physical education department according to total student rating and also total grade distribution rating a rank order correlation was calculated using the formula:

$$r' = 1 - \frac{6\sum D^2}{N(N^2-1)}$$

where D = the difference between a pair of ranks

N = the number of pair of ranks (91)

This resulted in an r' of .170. To test the independence of these two ranks a T test was performed using the formula:

$$t - \frac{r'}{\sqrt{1 - r'^2}} \qquad \sqrt{n - 2}$$

This resulted in a T of 1.632 which with 89 degrees of freedom was significant at the .10 level of confidence but not the .05 level.

The statistical evidence does not support the conclusion that instructors awarding higher marks should expect a higher rating from his students.

Honor Students Versus Total Student Population

Since rating by students began at St. Johns, faculty members have often wondered if their ratings would improve if they were permitted to teach the most outstanding students and were not encumbered with the less able ones.

In 1965-66 the evaluation program was so designed as to allow comparison between the ratings given by the honor students and those given by the total student population. When the rank order of both groups were placed side by side certain facts were evident. The honor students appear to be more sensitive to effective teaching. They tended to rate the "high" instructors higher and the "low" ones lower. The spread between the high and the low was 43.15 points for the honor students' rating as against 30.00 for the total population. Instructors' relative positions on the scale remained about the same for both groups.

Time of Day and Faculty Rating

Classes taught during the period immediately following noon was judged by some faculty to be one of the most difficult periods to challenge students. We noted through schedule requests that nine o'clock classes were preferred by both students and instructors. We were interested to see if students tended to rate their instructors higher at "preferred" hours.

Ratings of all instructors teaching classes at nine o'clock and one o'clock were plotted on respective graphs for comparison. There appeared to be little, if any, differences favoring the instructors during the preferred hour.

Other Findings and Observations

For four successive years the students have ranked the total faculty with respect to their qualifications in the following order: knowledge of subject, positive personal traits, evaluation of students (grading), and class presentation.

For the last two years the faculty coming to the College directly from graduate schools ranked higher than faculty from any other source: high school, business, military service, or other colleges. The students' ratings ranked the faculty in the order as listed.

Faculty with education degrees appear to enjoy slightly higher ratings as a whole than faculty without education degrees. It should be noted, however, that all instructors have academic majors in their teaching fields, and that most of the faculty members, regardless of their degrees, have some education courses. The writer would suggest refinement of design in regard to this study before conclusions are drawn.

Those of the administration who have observed student comments for four years have some very definite impressions about what students value and do not value. The students tend to equate exacting instruction with excellence. Low grades do not necessarily cause low ratings. The student values the classes in which his status is certain at all times. Faculty members who communicate definite objectives to their students, teach in terms of those objectives, and test on what they communicate to be the course objectives are given the highest ratings. If a student knows that he is failing and knows that it is "his own failure", he

does not generally penalize the instructor.

Instructional methods do not seem to matter. Discussion or lecture is equally valued if the instructor keeps to the point and only materials that have relevance to the course purposes are presented. Students do strongly insist that the instructor be "in charge of" his class. Students tend to rate down an instructor whose course is an easy mark, whose objectives are uncertain, whose classes are subject to student "take over," who uses test questions prepared by someone else (canned tests), who treats his students as immature, or who practices any one of a number of behaviors that are termed as unfair: "throwing curves," "having favorites," refusing to consider a student's complaint, etc.

No one division appears to have a monopoly on placing its faculty members on the top. Five of the seven divisions have had faculty to be placed within the top three positions in the rank order during four years of student ratings. Though the Division of Health and Physical Education has never placed in the order of the first three positions, yet that division maintains the highest overall average rating. The Technical Division is the newest division and has had no instructor yet to occupy any of the top three positions.

Conclusions and Recommendations

At this time student ratings of faculty seems to be well accepted by the faculty at St. Johns River Junior College. It may continue as a function for the improvement of teaching, tenure, merit pay, and other administrative considerations.

Faculty rating remains a delicate operation for it involves faculty morale which is more important to the success of an institution than any particular rating procedure. The instructional staff should continue to be represented on the committee that designs, plans, interprets, and limits the use of student evaluations.

It is recommended that considerable attention be given to developing a less arduous system for taking student ratings. Control should remain centralized and presentation to students uniform. The instructional dean and college president should treat with complete confidence all the personal information gained through the study and should provide for immediate conferences with each faculty member to discuss rating and to allay any anxiety that an instructor may have.

XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY

ADDENDUM #1

STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTOR

Scale: Superior . . . . . 5 points
Excellent . . . . . 4 points
Good . . . . . 3 points
Fair . . . . . 2 points
Poor . . . . . 1 point

Course _____ Instructor _____

POSITIVE PERSONAL TRAITS (1-5) _____
(Appearance, Attitude,
Judgement, etc.)

KNOWLEDGE (1-5) _____
(Command of Subject)

CLASS PRESENTATION (1-5_ _____
(Planning, Organization,
Skill)

EVALUATION OF STUDENTS (1-5) _____
(Understanding, Accurate,
Fair)

Comments: (Use Reverse Side if
Necessary)

XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY

ADDENDUM #II

ST JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE
PALATKA FLORIDA
FEBRUARY 11 1966

MEAN EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS BY THEIR OWN STUDENTS
ARRANGED IN RANK ORDER OF TOTAL PERCENTAGES

INST NO	PERSONAL TRAITS	KNOW LEDGE	CLASS PRESENT	EVALU ATION	TOTAL PERCENT
59	4 81	4 97	4 68	4 76	96 10
69	4 88	4 78	4 68	4 74	95 40
54	4 85	4 75	4 72	4 74	95 30
45	4 82	4 70	4 72	4 60	94 20
81	4 78	4 68	4 64	4 64	93 70
76	4 74	4 85	4 42	4 56	92 85
83	4 79	5 00	4 28	4 41	92 40
61	4 74	4 70	4 48	4 54	92 30
44	4 58	4 88	4 54	4 42	92 10
65	4 74	4 52	4 45	4 66	91 85
82	4 70	4 59	4 50	4 54	91 65
34	4 62	4 76	4 56	4 36	91 50
73	4 59	4 84	4 43	4 43	91 45
88	4 57	4 78	4 63	4 26	91 20
49	4 56	4 72	4 62	4 32	91 10
60	4 64	4 78	4 38	4 36	90 80
2	4 60	4 61	4 69	4 22	90 60
9	4 56	4 78	4 00	4 78	90 60
64	4 59	4 93	4 61	3 98	90 55
68	4 55	4 67	4 21	4 53	89 80
43	4 46	4 79	4 36	4 29	89 50
21	4 69	4 86	4 08	4 21	89 20
24	4 62	4 76	4 10	4 29	88 85

INST NO	PERSONAL TRAITS	KNOW LEDGE	CLASS PRESENT	EVALU ATION	TOTAL PERCENT
14	4 64	4 65	4 19	4 20	88 40
30	4 59	4 58	4 04	4 47	88 40
50	4 38	4 64	4 29	4 32	88 15
5	4 42	4 68	4 16	4 33	87 95
56	4 46	4 67	4 29	4 15	87 85
28	4 47	4 46	4 33	4 28	87 70
55	4 49	4 52	4 32	4 16	87 45
1	4 49	4 53	4 25	4 15	87 10
66	4 52	4 68	4 17	4 05	87 10
79	4 58	4 45	4 10	4 28	87 05
77	4 22	4 56	4 05	4 54	86 85
67	4 47	4 82	3 96	4 10	86 75
80	4 66	4 64	4 26	3 76	86 60
35	4 44	4 56	4 06	4 21	86 35
20	4 43	4 56	4 06	4 12	85 85
12	4 51	3 93	4 34	4 37	85 75
7	4 51	4 45	3 92	4 25	85 65
111	4 30	4 36	4 36	4 11	85 65
84	4 32	4 56	4 29	3 95	85 60
85	4 69	4 45	3 78	4 18	85 50
40	4 23	4 83	4 22	3 79	85 35
47	4 55	4 59	3 79	4 11	85 20
51	4 15	4 66	4 06	4 06	84 65
37	4 41	4 25	4 11	4 14	84 55
39	4 33	4 41	4 10	4 06	84 50
48	4 22	4 47	3 81	4 40	84 50
31	4 81	4 56	4 06	3 44	84 35
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

INST NO	PERSONAL TRAITS	KNOW LEDGE	CLASS PRESENT	EVALU ATION	TOTAL PERCENT
26	4 46	4 80	4 08	3 47	84 05
42	4 12	4 67	4 12	3 88	83 95
74	4 40	4 48	4 01	3 80	83 45
36	4 20	4 63	3 86	3 99	83 40
29	4 17	4 57	3 82	4 10	83 30
41	4 43	4 27	4 05	3 87	83 10
89	4 41	4 41	3 93	3 85	83 00
33	4 21	4 20	4 03	4 11	82 75
63	4 25	4 19	4 00	4 08	82 60
25	4 34	4 76	3 93	3 48	82 55
6	3 95	4 49	3 93	4 11	82 40
13	4 29	4 35	4 11	3 59	81 70
72	3 83	4 69	4 27	3 51	81 50
22	4 23	4 56	3 61	3 85	81 25
86	4 43	4 38	3 80	3 61	81 10
19	4 44	4 29	3 56	3 79	80 40
38	3 41	4 51	3 73	4 38	80 15
23	4 43	4 31	3 41	3 84	79 95
53	3 98	4 36	3 87	3 49	78 50
15	3 79	4 18	3 65	3 77	76 95
75	3 89	4 26	3 67	3 50	76 60
70	4 23	4 33	2 90	3 80	76 30
78	3 72	4 24	3 69	3 18	74 15
46	3 71	3 95	3 26	3 63	72 75
87	3 94	4 16	2 59	3 72	72 05
57	3 94	3 68	3 21	3 57	72 00
52	3 77	4 02	3 32	3 25	71 80

ST JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE
PALATKA FLORIDA
FEBRUARY 11 1966

PART TIME

MEAN EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS BY THEIR OWN STUDENTS
ARRANGED IN RANK ORDER OF TOTAL PERCENTAGES

INST NO	PERSONAL TRAITS	KNOW LEDGE	CLASS PRESENT	EVALU ATION	TOTAL PERCENT
27	3 78	3 86	3 03	3 22	69 45
96	4 10	3 30	3 40	3 80	73 00
17	3 97	3 92	3 15	3 58	73 10
99	4 26	4 26	3 05	3 68	76 25
95	3 94	4 56	3 11	4 06	78 35
105	4 20	4 30	3 60	3 70	79 00
103	4 35	4 47	3 41	3 82	80 25
62	4 37	4 45	3 74	4 12	83 40
18	4 91	4 27	4 00	4 36	87 70
110	4 52	4 52	3 95	4 57	87 80
100	4 50	5 00	4 12	4 29	89 55
90	4 70	4 80	4 35	4 15	90 00
8	4 55	4 70	4 46	4 43	90 70
11	4 58	4 70	4 51	4 53	91 60
93	4 41	4 91	4 45	4 59	91 80
98	5 00	4 50	4 25	4 75	92 50
115	5 00	4 50	4 25	4 75	92 50
10	4 86	4 57	4 86	5 00	96 45
71	5 00	5 00	4 67	4 78	97 25

ADDENDUM #3

ST. JOHNS RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE
Palatka, Florida
February 14, 1966

MEAN EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTS
ARRANGED IN RANK ORDER OF TOTAL PERCENTAGES

	Department	Personal Traits	Knowledge	Class Present.	Evaluation	Total Percent
1.	Physical Ed.	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.45	91.40
5.	Math & Science	4.44	4.60	4.08	4.14	86.30
3.	Communications	4.36	4.57	4.14	4.06	85.65
7.	Technical	4.37	4.45	3.97	4.02	84.05
2,	Soc. Science	4.36	4.52	3.91	3.92	83.55
4.	Humanities	4.16	4.38	3.87	4.02	82.15
6.	Business	4.25	4.32	3.78	3.96	81.55

ADDENDUM

This addendum is related to Albany Junior College, Albany, Georgia, where I became President from the presidency of St. Johns River Junior College, Palatka, Florida. As noted on page 3 of the St. Johns report, this procedure for student rating of faculty was developed under my supervision. The materials in this Addendum have been used at Albany Junior College. The completed tally sheets and accompanying remarks are intended as unidentified samples of how this procedure works.

April 12, 1967

B. R. Tilley, President
Albany Junior College
Albany, Georgia

Form No. C-6
AJC 6-3-66

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE
Intra-College Communication

Date: 1-26-67

To: Teaching Faculty

From: B. R. Tilley (President)
Acting Dean of Instruction

Subject: STUDENT FACULTY RATINGS
Fall Quarter, 1966

Near the end of the fall quarter, 1966, I met with the counseling sessions of the top 3/4 of our students to obtain their ratings and remarks of their teachers for the fall quarter. These were obtained in a confidential manner, with only preliminary information of procedures and without discussion. A copy of the form used is attached. Each student participating filled out one form for each class taken during the fall quarter. I have personally tabulated these responses and have prepared reports to the individuals concerned, copies attached.

The intent of this effort was to obtain general information and trends, rather than statistical details. Student ratings for each instructor were posted in tally form, for each class by meeting time and identified only by a code number. By interpelation an "average" was indicated for each item with connecting lines, giving a graphic image of the results. The remarks of students, by class hour, have been reproduced without editing and are also attached. My confidential file and your copies attached herewith, are the only records of this report.

It is realized that ratings and remarks of students concerning instruction should be considered cautiously along with other factors in evaluating the true effectiveness of teaching. However, by several years of experience, I have found that the composite ratings and remarks are very worthy of serious consideration and are very helpful in improving individual teachers as well as the instructional program as a whole. Generally speaking, our students are very pleased with the type of instruction they are getting here. I also believe that they have made a sincere effort to realistically record their evaluations of instruction received here for the fall quarter. I commend those teachers whose reports show high ratings and complimentary remarks. In those cases where needed improvements are indicated, I trust that the individual teachers concerned and the administrative officials involved may work together to make needed improvements.

BRT:jm

STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTOR
in TERMS of the "IDEAL"

Instructor_____

Course_____Hour_____

A. POSITIVE PERSONAL TRAITS
(Appearance, Attitude, Judgment,
Positive Influence, etc.) (0-25)_____*

x x x x

B. SCHOLARSHIP
(Knowledge of Subject) (0-25)_____

x x x x

C. CLASS PRESENTATION
(Planning, Organization,
Clarity) (0-25)_____

x x x x

D. EVALUATION OF STUDENTS
(Understanding, Fair
Accurate) (0-25)_____

x x x x

*Remarks are encouraged, particularly for exceptional ratings - high or low. Use space below and reverse side if necessary.

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE -- TALLY - STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTOR - CODE ___

ITEMS RATED	A. Positive Personal Traits, (Appearance, Attitude, Judgment, Positive Influence, etc.) (0-25) (Low-High)
	B. Scholarship (Knowledge of Subject) (0-25)
	C. Class Presentation (Planning, Organization, Clarity) (0-25)
	D. Evaluation of Students (Tests - Understanding, Fair, Accurate) (0-25)

CLASS TIME	_____ ___				_____ ___				_____ ___				Composite - All Ratings			
ITEM → SCORE ↓	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
25																
24																
23																
22																
21																
20																
19																
18																
17																
16																
15																
14																
13																
12																
11																
10-6																
5-0																
AVERAGE																
			TOTAL													

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE -- TALLY - STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTOR - CODE 3

ITEMS RATED	A. Positive Personal Traits, (Appearance, Attitude, Judgment, Positive Influence, etc.) (0-25) (Low-High)
	B. Scholarship (Knowledge of Subject) (0-25)
	C. Class Presentation (Planning, Organization, Clarity) (0-25)
	D. Evaluation of Students (Tests - Understanding, Fair, Accurate) (0-25)

CLASS TIME	[redacted] 8:00				[redacted] 10:00				[redacted] 3:00				Composite - All Ratings			
ITEM SCORE ↓	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
25	4	5	5	4	5	5	2	4	3	5	4	3				
24	1		1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	2					
23		1	1		1		1				1	1				
22		1			1	1		1	1							
21	1											1				
20	4	3	4	5	3	3	3	4	3	1	2	3				
19																
18																
17		1														
16																
15				2	2		4									
14																
13								1								
12																
11																
10-6					3			2								
5-0							1	2								
AVERAGE																
TOTAL																

STUDENT REMARKS - Fall Quarter, 1966

Instructor Code No. 3

Class No. 8 AM

(These remarks are being recorded essentially as written by the students without editing or comment.)

He is a very exceptional teacher. He knows his subject matter and also knows how to present it to the students in a way that they won't be confused.

I believe he deserves these high ratings. I've been thoroughly satisfied by being in his class and have thoroughly enjoyed the subject.

Excellent teacher.

Seems tohave a knowledge of all facets of subject, but could keep up with and learn about more new discoveries.

He is always neat and very nice. I accept everything he says because he really knows what he is talking about. I like the way he teaches as he really makes it clear to the students. I think he plays very fairly and gives his student exactly what he deserves.

DAMN GOOD TEACHER!

He is very neat and knows his subject very well. He is one of the best teachers I've heard about here at the College, but he is very hard. He can transpose the subject matter to the vernacular of his students. His genuine interest in spreading his knowledge of the subject to his students is an admirable trait. He seems to be well liked by all. I like him because he will only give you credit for what you have accomplished in his class. Amiability does enter into the classroom, but not into his grade book.

He is the most perfect teacher I have met. I don't think anyone could have a bad comment about this man, if so it would be because they are blaming him instead of themselves. I am failing in this course, but it is my fault.

An all-around good teacher.

He puts his information out in a clear manner, but it is a little to fast to comprehend. He needs to slow down a little.

He expects everyone to know what he is talking about, even though some have never had the subject. He is avery good teacher and knows what he is doing.

Makes a more direct approach toward the material than the presentation of the course in the book.

He is a friend to his students.

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE -- TALLY - STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTOR - CODE 12

ITEMS RATED	A. Positive Personal Traits, (Appearance, Attitude, Judgment, Positive Influence, etc.) (0-25) (Low-High)
	B. Scholarship (Knowledge of Subject) (0-25)
	C. Class Presentation (Planning, Organization, Clarity) (0-25)
	D. Evaluation of Students (Tests - Understanding, Fair, Accurate) (0-25)

CLASS TIME	[redacted] 8:00 A.M.				[redacted] 10:00 A.M.				[redacted] 12-Noon				Composite - All Ratings			
ITEM SCORE ↓	$_{33}$ A	B_{33}	C_{31}	D_{31}	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
25		4		1	4	5	1	6	3	5	1	3				
24		3						1				2				
23	1				1	6		2	1	3	1					
22		1			1	1	1									
21					1						1					
20	4	1	5	2	5		2	5	5	4	5	5				
19	1		1	1							1					
18			1			1	1	2								
17			1	1	2											
16																
15	5	1	3	5	3		4		4		1					
14																
13			1	1												
12	1			2												
11				1												
10-6	5		7	6	1		2	1	3		5	2				
5-0	2		3	2	1		1	3			2	1				
AVERAGE	13.4	23.4	13.2	13.4												
TOTAL																

STUDENT REMARKS - Fall Quarter, 1966

Instructor Code No. 12

Class 8 AM

(These remarks are being recorded essentially as written by the students without editing or comment.)

She is an instructor who knows her subject very well. She does, however, get off the subject, she tells us we are poor students and she gives unfair tests. One time she told us we would have one kind of tests, then turned around and gave us the complete opposite. I also feel she grades too strictly.

Has vast knowledge, but has trouble getting it across to the students. If she taught it like she wants to without complaining of students lack of background, she would be an exceptionally good teacher. Uses very fair of students and their work.

She finds it hard to adapt to the lack of a humanities course in the University System of Georgia, and to the fact that her course is a required one and everyone is not an English major. She speaks of being objective about grades and student-teacher relationship but fails to follow through in her actions. I hold a true respect for her knowledge, but cannot help but feel that I would truly prefer another instructor. Because of our complaints, she has become obsessed with martyrdom and lectures about the perverse pleasure we get from "hurting" her.

She knows the subject, but cannot present it clearly to the students. Her attitude toward the students is that of resentment. She spends almost half the class time voicing complaints against us and then wonders why we never have enough time to cover the material. She is a very sweet person, but not a very capable teacher in this area unless her attitude toward the student changes.

I have the greatest respect and admiration for her. I feel that she is much to emotional in her present outlook. She's better than one gives her credit for. The only weakness is she tries to be human, but people take advantage of this. She's really good!

As a person, she is wonderful. But, she is too sensitive as a teacher. She needs a better outlook toward her students as she feels we have done her wrong. It is more important to study and discuss the text than to get sidetracked.

She is much too sensitive. Talks about how much our class has ruined her life, too much. Tests are unrelated to lectures. In my opinion the tests are geared for graduate students. Note: I am passing the course.

A very good teacher because she has helped me have a better interest in my subject.

She knows her subject well, but she can't seem to convey it well enough to the class. She doesn't have a very mature mind concering some things. Her tests are sometimes unfair. She seems to be a sweet person, but not able to teacher this particular course to our understanding.

She doesn't present her lectures well. She resents our giving an opinion because she feels we aren't qualified to give one. I do feel she knows her subject, though.

Although she seems to know her material, she continuously digresses on subjects totally irrelevant to the class. She tears the students down with her attitude and destroys all interest in the work. She is totally unfair in her treatment toward the class as a whole, and she begrudges for the acts of a few. Does not allow deep discussion on the "whys of literature."

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE -- TALLY - STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTOR - CODE 14

ITEMS RATED	A. Positive Personal Traits, (Appearance, Attitude, Judgment, Positive Influence, etc.) (0-25) (Low-High) B. Scholarship (Knowledge of Subject) (0-25) C. Class Presentation (Planning, Organization, Clarity) (0-25) D. Evaluation of Students (Tests - Understanding, Fair, Accurate) (0-25)

CLASS TIME	[redacted] 9:00				[redacted] 12:00				[redacted] 1:00				Composite - All Ratings			
ITEM SCORE ↓	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
25	2	3	3		7	6	1	7	6	7	2	5				
24	1	2	1		2	4	1		1							
23		1			2	2	2	2				1				
22		1		1				2	1	2						
21																
20	3	1	5	4	4		5	2	4	5	3	5				
19			1													
18							1									
17									1							
16																
15	1	1	4	3			4	2	3	2	4	1				
14																
13																
12																
11																
10-6			4								1					
5-0								1	1		2	4				
AVERAGE																
			TOTAL													

STUDENT REMARKS - Fall Quarter, 1966

Instructor Code No. 14

Class 9 AM

(These remarks are being recorded essentially as written by the students without editing or comment.)

She is an exceptional teacher. She always encourages every student to do their best and a little more. She has confidence in herself as being a teacher, who knows the subject. I have benefitted every day from her class. My only criticism is she needs to have all her books and papers in her class room before she calls class together.

She makes class very interesting. This is the first time I have ever learned any of this subject.

She repeats herself on a certain part of speech in which maybe she could go, or clear it up in a few short words.

She is a very nice lady and she knows what she is talking about. Sometimes she is very lenient with the other students.

Interesting class. Instructor is well liked.

She jumps from one subject to the other, but tries as hard as she can in getting the message across.

She is a very fine and understanding person, and we need more teachers like her.

Explains questions clearly, but is a little disorganized. Treats each student individually.

Fair with all of her students.

She is a fine teacher, but she stays on one subject to long or spends a long part of the class period helping maybe one student.

Class 12 Noon

She tries very hard to understand her students. She spends much time with us and shows us that she is interested, not only in our course but our problems also.

Outstanding teacher - loves her work - should not let classroom discussions wander - needs to stick to the subject matter more closely.

Too much preaching, not enought meat in course other than this, course is very interesting. Sometimes feel I would receive lower marks if I expressed myself in such a way if I like to.

Her assignments are often not very evenly distributed - very little at times, and to much at times.

Too easily misled. A students acts as though he tries canget by with things and one who tries but never makes excuses is cut down. (Very easily brown-nosed.) If a student acts as though he were a Christian, he tends to get better grades. This type of thing pleases her.

Would like for her to teach 102. Excellent teacher, interesting, makes classroom work very interesting. Fair to students

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE -- TALLY - STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTOR - CODE 21

ITEMS RATED	A. Positive Personal Traits, (Appearance, Attitude, Judgment, Positive Influence, etc.) (0-25) (Low-High)
	B. Scholarship (Knowledge of Subject) (0-25)
	C. Class Presentation (Planning, Organization, Clarity) (0-25)
	D. Evaluation of Students (Tests - Understanding, Fair, Accurate) (0-25)

CLASS TIME	[redacted] 9:00 AM				[redacted] 12:00				[redacted] 1:00				Composite - All Ratings			
ITEM → / SCORE ↓	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
25	//// ////	/// ////	/ ////	/// ////	//// ////	//// ////	/ ////	/ ////	//// ////	//// ////	////	//// ///				
24		/	//	//	/		/		///	/						
23	///	/	/	/		//			//	/	/	/				
22	/	/			/			/	/	//						
21		/														
20	////	///	///- ///	////	////	///	///- /	///- ///	///- /	///- ///	///- //	///- ///				
19				/												
18			/						/			//				
17												/				
16																
15			////	/		/	///- /	/	/	/	///- /	//				
14											/					
13												—				
12				/							////					
11																
10-6			/				/	/			/	/				
5-0																
AVERAGE																
			TOTAL													

STUDENT REMARKS - Fall Quarter, 1966

Instructor Code No. 21 *

*These remarks are being recorded essentially as written by the students without editing or comment.

Class 9 AM

Class presentation is planned and organized well, but delivery is very poor. Delivery is to fast, in a monotone.

He has been most considerate in his evaluation of students, understanding if a student seems to be trying, but not quite making the grade. On all tests, the overall accomplishment of the class has entered into the evaluation of the individual.

Material is not covered in a chronological order. Much skipping around and over-lapping. Tests are infrequent with a very large amount of material covering as many as five or six chapters. Tests graded on a very loose curve. Persons who are not doing college level work are passing. I feel that this will be a disadvantage to the student should he continue to study history.

He has impressed me as a teacher who knows his subject and wants to know more - in other words I feel that he realizes he is just beginning and knows that a continuous intake of knowledge is necessary for a continual success as a teacher. His appearance is excellent. At times, his organization of the subject is a little confusing (but, in history this is easy). Perhaps the organization could be clearer. I think that his tests are hard and challenging, but they are also fair in that he does not give anything on his tests which he has not covered in class. He is also cooperative and will take time to discuss problems.

He is a very fair man. He is always neat and he has his lessons always planned and very well organized. He brings in a lot of material our book doesn't have that we need to know.

He is avery good teacher and has a great understanding of the subject. I feel though, that he needs improvement in his class presentation. The classes become very boring at times. His tests are very hard. I think the main problem is that on his tests there is to much to cover and know it well. The course is detailed and if he could have more tests covering less material, then I think that would end many of the low grades.

I don't think many of his students are receiving full benefit from his lectures by the way he organizes his lectures. It could just be me though. He is very interesting in a student doing well in history and is a good teacher.

An excellent teacher.

His lecture notes are not at all organized with the text as the chronological happenings. He also speaks too softly.

My favorite. He puts a lot of work in his lectures - really cares about his students. He wants very much for us to get a lot out of his course.

Very fair with his grading.

Definitely knows his subject. Presents it well and can explain any questions. At times could speak a little louder and more distinctly. He has been fair and understanding in evaluation, though his tests are pretty "deep."

He is an excellent instructor but I don't think his objective tests reveal to him what the pupil really knows about the subject.

ALBANY JUNIOR COLLEGE -- TALLY - STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTOR - CODE 2H

ITEMS RATED
A. Positive Personal Traits, (Appearance, Attitude, Judgment, Positive Influence, etc.) (0-25) (Low-High)
B. Scholarship (Knowledge of Subject) (0-25)
C. Class Presentation (Planning, Organization, Clarity) (0-25)
D. Evaluation of Students (Tests - Understanding, Fair, Accurate) (0-25)

CLASS TIME	[redacted] 10:00				[redacted] 11:00				[redacted] 7:00P				Composite - All Ratings			
ITEM SCORE → ↓	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
25																
24																
23																
22																
21																
20																
19																
18																
17																
16																
15																
14																
13																
12																
11																
10-6																
5-0																
AVERAGE																
			TOTAL													

(28) Found to be using "prepared" tests from a "big book."